		Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	
IPM	1	Gaps exist around defining target state requirements for FP and Title IV operations; current efforts do not include these areas. Replacing/ reengineering PEPS or designing IPD without this information could result in incomplete solution or more costly additions downstream.	High	High	High	Add FY04 activity related to identifying business objectives and high level requirements for these groups	Closed	Log as dependency
IPM	2	Lack of understanding/ integrated approach for alignment of eCMO and Integrated Partner Data efforts prior to any detailed design/ build may lead to rework, redundancies or incomplete solution.	High	High	High	Can be managed via phased approach	Open	
IPM	3	Inability to successfully deploy Integrated Partner Management will impact large number of operational systems/ business processes	High	Medium	High		Open	
IPM	4	May not get full funding for core capabilities across Integrated Partner Management	High	Medium	Low	Need to determine approach and whether phased-in is required/possible/etc.; prioritize components	Open	
IPM	5	Undefined impact of deploying Integrated Partner Management components on external partners could lead to: community resistance to full deployment and/ or not fully realizing benefits of solution	High	Low	High		Open	
AD	6	Lack of complete design/ implementation plan for CSID in time for development within application processing	Medium	High	High	Requirements identified as of 04/2003 will be included in 01/2004 CPS release, remaining requirements will not be included until 01/2005 CPS release	Closed	Log as dependency
AD	7	SAIG unable to handle increased file size/ volume due to XML ISIR (04-05)	High	Medium	High	Defer implementation of XML ISIR in EDExpress to 2004-05; complete SAIG capacity analysis and implement required changes prior to 2005-06 processing	Closed	Log as dependency
AD	8	SAIG unable to handle increased file size/ volume due to XML ISIR (05-06)	High	High	High	complete SAIG capacity analysis and implement required changes prior to 2005-06 processing	Open	
AD	9	Minimum hardware/ sofware requirements have not been updated to accommodate additional needs related to XML use; schools may not be prepared/ have adequate time to prepare for XML roll-out	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	10	Unknown impacts on EDExpress users (schools) in 2003-04 due to Common Record processing (capacity and hardware issues due to increased file size)	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	11	Barriers to adoption/ proper implementation of XML by community (schools, vendors) will minimize benefits of XML and may lead to increased processing issues	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	12	Lack of integrated approach for alignment of ED PIN and Security Architecture may lead to incomplete recommendations/ solution	Low	High	High	Already mitigating	Open	
AD	13	VDC may not have the capacity to support Application improvements	Low	Low	High	Request money in business case, plan and track, general operations	Open	
AD	14	VDC hardware refresh complete without ED PIN Reengineering analysis and implementation may lead to rework	Medium	High	High		Open	
AD	15	Unknown impact on SAIG of increased traffic/ volume in 2003-04 due to increase in full participants (COD)	High	High	Low	Review SAIG capacity planning: validate assumptions	Open	
AD	16	Issues associated with possible conversion of CPS to new contractor (may include PIC and editorial services under CPS)	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	17	No funding for EDPIN Re-engineering or Security Architecture	High	Medium	Low		Open	
AD	18	Issues associated with possible conversion of COD to new contractor	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	19	Issues associated with possible conversion of NSLDS to new contractor	High	High	Medium			
CSB	20	The inability to provide adequate requirements in the CSB SOW for enterprise efforts such as CSID, RID/Access Mgt/SSO and Web Services/Portals may lead to incomplete solution	High	High	Low		Open	
CSB	21	Issues associated with possible conversion of CSB to new contractor	High	High	Medium			
CSB	22	The CSB transition strategy will require a routing solution during parallel processing, which is not yet defined. This impacts feeds from other systems (i.e. COD), mail processing and customer service.	High	High	High	EAI/ITA and Data Strategy to have an off-line discussion about options for routing solution	Open	

		Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	
CSB	23	Detailed dependencies across data strategy components and CSB have not yet been identified; may impact the CSB evaluation and negotiation period.	Medium	High	High	Notes: The Data Strategy team needs to be kept in the loop regarding the determination/selection of the CSB solution. Potential bidders need to understand Web Services/Data Strategy/Integrated Student Management efforts as they relate to different access

Data Strategy will sync up with CSB in Sept/Oct

Make CSB SOW flexible enough to incorporate DS items | Open | |
CSB	24	The decision regarding the potential FMS/FMSS merge (11i upgrade).	High	Medium	Low		Open	Document as key decision milestone on timelines; log all dependencies
CSB	25	Lack of FSA resources to ensure successful conversion and implementation of new consolidated solutions, resulting in decreased customer service/collections.	High	Medium	Low		Open	
Ent	26	Lack of enterprise understanding of current security standards (e.g.: items to be included during requirements and test phases of SLC); and, therefore, inability to confirm that overall security requirements are being met across SLC, system accreditation,	Medium	High	High	Review current SLC	Open	Scheduled for 07/10/2003 BIG meeting
Ent	27	No enterprise method/ review of application level security (gap between application test and security/ accred review), especially related to legacy systems	Low	High	High	Security architecture will show this as part of recommended on-going architecture, BIG needs to determine whether to recommend as priority implementation item	Open	
Ent	28	No enterprise standards/ solution for disaster recovery; currently only at application level, which may lead to vulnerabilities in continuity of operations related to cross-system functions	Medium	Low	High		Open	
Ent	29	Difficulty of implementing an Enterprise Wide Disaster Recovery Plan	High	Low	Medium		Open	
Ent	30	Large level of effort required to implement security architecture at enterprise level may impact ability to successfully deploy security framework	Low	Medium	Low		Open	
Ent	31	Numerous major systems going into re-compete at the same time	High	High	Medium		Open	
Ent	32	Re-authorization changes are not known at this point (what and timeframe)	High	Medium	Low		Open	
Ent	33	Hosting CSB at VDC may impact operations of other core systems, resources and hw/sw requirements	High	Medium	High	Ensure CSC can support - get plans on how CSC will support (proper review of resources, etc.)	Open	
Ent	34	Lack of clarity regarding 'financial' system status and required sub-ledger functions of DLSS, COD & eCampus Based impacts, scope and *(impact of what a financial system means is unclear - no one understands what being part of a financial suite means-no clear direction from DoED as to where ledgers will be housed)* interface with FMS and CMDM.	Medium	High	Medium			
Ent	35	Capacity of SAIG to support CSB and others	High	Low	High	Determine CSB needs	Open	
Ent	36	Lack of clarity around how CSB fits into Integrated Partner Management, CMO, RID, Single Sign - on may lead to incomplete solution	High	Medium	High		Open	

		Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	
IPM	1	Gaps exist around defining target state requirements for FP and Title IV operations; current efforts do not include these areas. Replacing/ reengineering PEPS or designing IPD without this information could result in incomplete solution or more costly additions downstream.	High	High	High	Add FY04 activity related to identifying business objectives and high level requirements for these groups	Closed	Log as dependency
IPM	2	Lack of understanding/ integrated approach for alignment of eCMO and Integrated Partner Data efforts prior to any detailed design/ build may lead to rework, redundancies or incomplete solution.	High	High	High	Can be managed via phased approach	Open	
IPM	3	Inability to successfully deploy Integrated Partner Management will impact large number of operational systems/ business processes	High	Medium	High		Open	
IPM	4	May not get full funding for core capabilities across Integrated Partner Management	High	Medium	Low	Need to determine approach and whether phased-in is required/possible/etc.; prioritize components	Open	
IPM	5	Undefined impact of deploying Integrated Partner Management components on external partners could lead to: community resistance to full deployment and/ or not fully realizing benefits of solution	High	Low	High		Open	

Integration Risks-Application and Delivery

		Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	
AD	1	Lack of complete design/ implementation plan for CSID in time for development within application processing	Medium	High	High	Requirements identified as of 04/2003 will be included in 01/2004 CPS release, remaining requirements will not be included until 01/2005 CPS release	Closed	Log as dependency
AD	2	SAIG unable to handle increased file size/ volume due to XML ISIR (04-05)	High	Medium	High	Defer implementation of XML ISIR in EDExpress to 2004-05; complete SAIG capacity analysis and implement required changes prior to 2005-06 processing	Closed	Log as dependency
AD	3	SAIG unable to handle increased file size/ volume due to XML ISIR (05-06)	High	High	High	complete SAIG capacity analysis and implement required changes prior to 2005-06 processing	Open	
AD	4	Minimum hardware/ sofware requirements have not been updated to accommodate additional needs related to XML use; schools may not be prepared/ have adequate time to prepare for XML roll-out	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	5	Unknown impacts on EDExpress users (schools) in 2003-04 due to Common Record processing (capacity and hardware issues due to increased file size)	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	6	Barriers to adoption/ proper implementation of XML by community (schools, vendors) will minimize benefits of XML and may lead to increased processing issues	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	7	Lack of integrated approach for alignment of ED PIN and Security Architecture may lead to incomplete recommendations/ solution	Low	High	High	Already mitigating	Open	
AD	8	VDC may not have the capacity to support Application improvements	Low	Low	High	Request money in business case, plan and track, general operations	Open	
AD	9	VDC hardware refresh complete without ED PIN Reengineering analysis and implementation may lead to rework	Medium	High	High		Open	
AD	10	Unknown impact on SAIG of increased traffic/ volume in 2003-04 due to increase in full participants (COD)	High	High	Low	Review SAIG capacity planning: validate assumptions	Open	
AD	11	Issues associated with possible conversion of CPS to new contractor (may include PIC and editorial services under CPS)	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	12	No funding for EDPIN Re-engineering or Security Architecture	High	Medium	Low		Open	
AD	13	Issues associated with possible conversion of COD to new contractor	High	High	Medium		Open	
AD	14	Issues associated with possible conversion of NSLDS to new contractor	High	High	Medium			

		Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	
CSB	1	The inability to provide adequate requirements in the CSB SOW for enterprise efforts such as CSID, RID/Access Mgt/SSO and Web Services/Portals may lead to incomplete solution	High	High	Low		Open	
CSB	2	Issues associated with possible conversion of CSB to new contractor	High	High	Medium			
CSB	3	The CSB transition strategy will require a routing solution during parallel processing, which is not yet defined. This impacts feeds from other systems (i.e. COD), mail processing and customer service.	High	High	High	EAI/ITA and Data Strategy to have an off-line discussion about options for routing solution	Open	
CSB	4	Detailed dependencies across data strategy components and CSB have not yet been identified; may impact the CSB evaluation and negotiation period.	Medium	High	High	Notes: The Data Strategy team needs to be kept in the loop regarding the determination/selection of the CSB solution. Potential bidders need to understand Web Services/Data Strategy/Integrated Student Management efforts as they relate to different access Data Strategy will sync up with CSB in Sept/Oct Make CSB SOW flexible enough to incorporate DS items	Open	
CSB	5	The decision regarding the potential FMS/FMSS merge (11i upgrade).	High	Medium	Low		Open	Document as key decision milestone on timelines; log all dependencies
CSB	6	Lack of FSA resources to ensure successful conversion and implementation of new consolidated solutions, resulting in decreased customer service/collections.	High	Medium	Low		Open	

		Risk Description	Priority	Probability	Ability to Control	Mitigation Plan	Status	
Ent	1	Lack of enterprise understanding of current security standards (e.g.: items to be included during requirements and test phases of SLC); and, therefore, inability to confirm that overall security requirements are being met across SLC, system accreditation,	Medium	High	High	Review current SLC	Open	Scheduled for 07/10/2003 BIG meeting
Ent	2	No enterprise method/ review of application level security (gap between application test and security/ accred review), especially related to legacy systems	Low	High	High	Security architecture will show this as part of recommended on-going architecture, BIG needs to determine whether to recommend as priority implementation item	Open	
Ent	3	No enterprise standards/ solution for disaster recovery; currently only at application level, which may lead to vulnerabilities in continuity of operations related to cross-system functions	Medium	Low	High		Open	
Ent	4	Difficulty of implementing an Enterprise Wide Disaster Recovery Plan	High	Low	Medium		Open	
Ent	5	Large level of effort required to implement security architecture at enterprise level may impact ability to successfully deploy security framework	Low	Medium	Low		Open	
Ent	6	Numerous major systems going into re-compete at the same time	High	High	Medium		Open	
Ent	7	Re-authorization changes are not known at this point (what and timeframe)	High	Medium	Low		Open	
Ent	8	Hosting CSB at VDC may impact operations of other core systems, resources and hw/sw requirements	High	Medium	High	Ensure CSC can support - get plans on how CSC will support (proper review of resources, etc.)	Open	
Ent	9	Lack of clarity regarding 'financial' system status and required sub-ledger functions of DLSS, COD & eCampus Based impacts, scope and *(impact of what a financial system means is unclear - no one understands what being part of a financial suite means-no clear direction from DoED as to where ledgers will be housed)* interface with FMS and CMDM.	Medium	High	Medium			
Ent	10	Capacity of SAIG to support CSB and others	High	Low	High	Determine CSB needs	Open	
Ent	11	Lack of clarity around how CSB fits into Integrated Partner Management, CMO, RID, Single Sign - on may lead to incomplete solution	High	Medium	High		Open	